fendant Williams was charged with causing the acts of repackaging and dispensing involved in the other 6 counts of the information.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (b) (2), the repackaged drugs failed to bear labels containing an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents; and, Section 502 (f) (1), the labeling of the repackaged drugs failed to bear adequate directions for use.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (b) (1), the repackaged *methamphetamine hydrochloride tablets* and a portion of the *methyltestosterone tablets* failed to bear labels containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; Section 502 (e) (2), a portion of the *methamphetamine hydrochloride tablets* failed to bear a label containing the common or usual name of each active ingredient of the drug; and, Section 502 (f) (2), all of the repackaged *methamphetamine hydrochloride tablets* failed to bear labeling containing adequate warnings against use in those pathological conditions where their use may be dangerous to health, and against unsafe dosage and methods and duration of administration, in such manner and form, as are necessary for the protection of users.

DISPOSITION: June 12, 1953. Pleas of guilty having been entered, the court fined Defendant Reynolds $15 and Defendant Williams $150.

4188. Misbranding of dextro-amphetamine sulfate tablets. U. S. v. Granville V. Coots. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $1. (F. D. C. No. 31255. Sample Nos. 20928–L, 20930–L, 20954–L, 20956–L.)

INFORMATION FILED: June 26, 1953, Northern District of Texas, against Granville V. Coots, manager of Field's Cut Rate Drug Store, Dallas, Tex.

ALLEGED VIOLATION: On or about May 16 and 17, 1951, while a number of *dextro-amphetamine sulfate tablets* were being held for sale at Field's Cut Rate Drug Store, after shipment in interstate commerce, the defendant caused a number of the tablets to be repacked and dispensed without a physician's prescription, which acts resulted in the repackaged tablets being misbranded.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (b) (1) and (2), the repackaged tablets failed to bear a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor, and an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents; and, Section 502 (f) (1), the labeling of the repackaged tablets failed to bear adequate directions for use. Further misbranding, Section 502 (e) (1), portions of the repackaged tablets failed to bear labels containing the common or usual name of the drug.

DISPOSITION: September 24, 1953. The defendant having entered a plea of nolo contendere, the court fined him $1.

4189. Misbranding of Char-Co Compound. U. S. v. 56½ Cases, etc. (F. D. C. No. 35285. Sample No. 46469–L.)

LIBEL FILED: June 12, 1953, Southern District of Texas.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: Between February 1 and April 30, 1953, from Maplewood, Mo.

PRODUCT: 56½ cases, each full case containing 12 12-ounce bottles, of *Char-Co Compound* at Houston, Tex., in the possession of K. G. Peters, together with a number of display posters entitled "Ask Your Druggist for" and a number of leaflets entitled "W. H. Peters Char-Co Compound * * * for Stomach Trouble."

RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION: The above-mentioned literature was printed for the consignee and was distributed by him to prospective customers (individuals) and to drug stores that stocked the product.

LABEL, IN PART: (Bottle) "W. H. Peters Char-Co Compound Treatment for Alleviation of Stomach Distress Symptoms Due to Excess Acid * * * Contents: Charcoal, Milk Magnesia, Magnesium Trisilicate, Aluminum Hydroxide Gel."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the above-mentioned display posters and in the leaflets accompanying the article were false and misleading. The statements represented and suggested that the article was an adequate and effective treatment for stomach ulcers and stomach trouble, whereas the article was not an adequate and effective treatment for such conditions.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (f) (1), the labeling of the article failed to bear adequate directions for use in the treatment of stomach ulcers and stomach trouble, which were the conditions for which the article was intended.

The article was misbranded in the above respects while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce.

DISPOSITION: August 26, 1953. W. H. Peters, claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the court ordered that the product be released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

4190. Misbranding of Magnetic Ray belt. U. S. v. 5 Devices, etc. (F. D. C. No. 35293. Sample No. 59163–L.)

LIBEL FILED: June 11, 1953, Southern District of Florida.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about April 29, 1953, from Coppell, Tex., by F. B. Moran, doing business as the Magnetic Ray Co.

PRODUCT: 5 unlabeled devices known as *Magnetic Ray belt* at St. Petersburg, Fla., in the possession of F. H. Squire, together with a number of testimonial letters accompanying the devices. The device consisted essentially of a circular coil of electric wire, with an electric plug attachment for plugging into the house current.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the labeling of the device, namely, the above-mentioned testimonial letters which were used by F. H. Squire to promote the sale and rental of the device, contained statements which were false and misleading. The statements represented and suggested that the device provided an adequate and effective treatment for headache, insomnia, impaired heart action, constipation, abnormal blood pressure, paralytic stroke, bad veins, epilepsy, tumors, lumbago, asthma, hardening of the arteries, arthritis, varicose veins, and tonsillitis. The device did not provide an adequate and effective treatment for such conditions. The device was misbranded in the above respects while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (b) (1), the device failed to bear a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and, Section 502 (f) (1), the device, when introduced into interstate commerce, was intended for use in the cure, mitigation, and treatment of disease in man, and it neither bore nor was accompanied by labeling bearing adequate directions for use since it had no labeling. The device was misbranded in these respects when introduced into and while in interstate commerce.